<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 12-24 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I.   <u>35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 12-24</u>

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5, 7-8 and 12-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiota et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,337,712) in view of Hunt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,235) and in further view of Katsurabayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,996,002). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claims 1, 5, 7 and 8, the Office Action states:

Shiota discloses:

- Acquiring an image file name from said server (column 3, lines 29-41, column 5, lines 62-67, column 6, lines 1-30);
- Converting said image file to generate a predetermined formed compressed image data which has a file name relating to said unique image file name (column 5, lines 42-67);
- Sending said predetermined formed compressed image data to said server (column 2, lines 41-47, 65-67, column 3, lines 1-3, column 4, lines 20-30, column 5, lines 56-60, column 6, lines 8-9).

Shiota does not explicitly disclose:

- Generating an image file in response to an operator of said client terminal specifying a screen range of said client terminal, wherein the image file is generated based on image data from the specified screen range;

However, in an analogous art, Hunt discloses an operator sending image control information to the server, determining a quality-size tradeoff for the graphical image, and receiving from the server the graphical image based on the image control information from the operator (column 2, lines 34-40, column 3, lines 3-4, 6-10, 18-20, 47-52, column 5, lines 1-5, column 9, lines 40-42, column 11, lines 5-9, 31-33, 35-37, 40-42, column 12, lines 20-23, 49-51). Therefore, Hunt teaches generating an image file in response to an operator specifying a screen range, wherein the image file is generated based on image data from the specified screen range.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate generating an image file in response to an operator specifying a screen range in Shiota's method enabling only the amount of graphical image

needed to be transmitted which in turn requiring less bandwidth to be used and improving transmission time.

Shiota, in view of Hunt, does not explicitly disclose:

• Posting the file name of said predetermined formed compressed image data to the client terminals collaborating with said client terminal. However, in an analogous art, Kat discloses sending individual data to other computers in response to a command from the specific operator who created the individual data so as to display the data on other computers as created shared data. Kat, therefore, discloses posting the file name of said predetermined formed compressed image data to the client terminals collaborating with said client terminal.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate or implement posting a file name of image data to the client terminals collaborating with the client terminal in Shiota's method in order to display the individual data on other computers in response to a command from the operator who created the individual data.

Office Action dated December 22, 2003, pages 2-4.

Claim 1, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 5, 7 and 8 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

1.   A method of communicating on a communication system having a client terminal connecting a server through a network and collaborating with other client terminals connected to said network, said method comprising the steps of:

(a) generating an image file in response to an operator of said client terminal specifying a screen range of said client terminal, wherein the image file is generated based on image data from the specified screen range;

(b) acquiring an image file name from said server;

(c) converting said image file to generate a predetermined formed compressed image data which has a file name relating to said image file name;

(d) sending said predetermined formed compressed image data to said server; and

(e) posting the file name of said predetermined formed compressed image data to the client terminals collaborating with said client terminal.

Neither Shiota, Hunt nor Katsurabayashi, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests generating an image file in response to an operator of said client terminal specifying a screen range of said client terminal, wherein the image file is generated based on image data from the specified screen range. The Office action admits that

Shiota does not teach this feature; however, the Office Action alleges that Hunt teaches this feature at column 2, lines 34-40, column 3, lines 3-4, 6-10, 18-20, 47-52, column 5, lines 1-5, column 9, lines 40-42, column 11, lines 5-9, 31-33, 35-37, 40-42, and column 12, lines 20-23, 49-51, which reads as follows:

> a request for a graphical image from a client machine, the graphical image being stored on the server machine and having a predetermined total image size; obtaining image control information; determining an appropriate amount of data for the graphical image to be transmitted based on at least the image control information

(Column 2, lines 34-40)

> sending image control information from the client machine to the server machine

(Column 3, lines 3-4)

> determined amount being based on at least the image control information. Preferably, the determined amount is a reduced amount, and the graphical image file received also has a determined format based on at least the image control information

(Column3, lines 6-10)

> receive the request and the client image control information from the client machine, determine an appropriate amount of data for the graphical image file requested

(Column 3, lines 18-20)

> Another advantage is that a user has a choice as to the amount of a graphical image file needed depending on an intended use for the image. For example, if images are simply being displayed in a small one inch by one inch arrangement, then only a small amount of the graphical image file need be transmitted.

(Column 3, lines 47-52)

> Each such image is stored on the server 102 as an image file. The client 104 sends a request for an image over a link 106 to the server 102. The server 102 then in turn sends an appropriate amount of data for the corresponding image file to the client 104 over a link 108.

(Column 5, lines 1-5)

> As an example, the request would identify the graphical image file desired together with a total image size and a requested quality level.

(Column 9, lines 40-42)

the web server processing 1000 determines 1008 an image format and file size for the requested graphical image file. In effect, the determining 1008 customizes the graphical image file based on criteria such as user's conditions, server's conditions, user's request or author's preference.

(Column 11, lines 5-9)

The image customization processing 1100 initially obtains 1102 image control data from the web browser (client image control data).

(Column 11, lines 31-33)

Next, a decision 1106 determines whether the image control data from the web browser includes a user request.

(Column 11, lines 35-37)

If not, the file size for the determined image file is set 1108 to user_size, which indicates that the file size is set by a user's choice or expected choice.

(Column 11, lines 40-42)

When the user intends to use the graphical image file for display on a display device, the format includes a display format suitable for the display device associated with the web browser

(Column 12, lines 20-23)

The user preference could be a user selected choice of quality versus size for image files or something that is predicted for the user.

(Column 12, lines 49-51)

While all of these sections may relate to sending images from a client to a server, there is nothing in these sections, or any other section of Hunt, that teaches generating an image file in response to an operator of said client terminal specifying a screen range of said client terminal, wherein the image file is generated based on image data from the specified screen range. There is no mention whatsoever in the Hunt reference as to selecting a screen range from a client terminal and generating an image based on image data from the specified screen range. Hunt only teaches a method and system for transmitting graphical images from a server to a client in response to a client request.

There is no need in the system of Hunt to select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range.

Furthermore, there is not so much as a suggestion in any of the reference to modify the references to include such features. That is, there is no teaching or suggestion in Shiota, Hunt or Katsurabayashi that a problem exists for which generating an image file in response to an operator of said client terminal specifying a screen range of said client terminal, wherein the image file is generated based on image data from the specified screen range is a solution. To the contrary, Shiota is only concerned with transferring pictures directly from a digital camera. Hunt only transmits graphical images from a server to a client in response to a client request. Katsurabayashi actually teaches away from the presently claimed invention since Katsurabayashi is directed to client-to-client communications rather than client-to-server communications. None of the references even recognizes a need to select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range.

One of ordinary skill in the art, being presented only with Shiota, Hunt and Katsurabayashi, and without having a prior knowledge of Applicants' claimed invention, would not have found it obvious to combine and modify Shiota, Hunt and Katsurabayashi to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention. To the contrary, even if one were somehow motivated to combine Shiota, Hunt and Katsurabayashi, and it were somehow possible to combine the three systems, the result would not be the invention as recited in claim 1. The resulting system still would not select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range.

Thus, neither Shiota, Hunt nor Katsurabayashi, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features in independent claims 1, 5, 7 and 8. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 5, 7 and 8, neither Shiota, Hunt nor Katsurabayashi, either alone or in combination teach or suggest all of the features of dependent claims 12-24, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectively requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 12-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Moreover, in addition to their dependency from independent claims 1, 5 and 8 respectively, the combination of Shiota, Hunt and Katsurabayashi do not teach or suggest the specific features recited in dependent claims 12-24. For example, with regard to

claims 12, 17 and 20, the combination of Shiota, Hunt and Katsurabayashi does not teach or suggest where the operator specifies a screen range of said client terminal by manipulating a mouse to define a frame, wherein the frame encloses the screen range. The Office Action alleges that Hunt teaches this feature. As discussed above, Hunt does not select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range. Thus, there would be no need for the Hunt reference to manipulate a mouse to define a frame that would enclose a screen range.

As an additional example, with regard to claims 13, 18 and 21, the combination of Shiota, Hunt and Katsurabayashi does not teach or suggest where the operator specifies a screen range of said client terminal by selecting an application window, wherein a frame of the application window defines the screen range. The Office Action alleges that Hunt teaches this feature. Again, as discussed above, Hunt does not select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range. Thus, there would be no need for the Hunt reference to specify a screen range of a client terminal by selecting an application window that defines the screen range.

As a further example, with regard to claims 14, 19 and 22, the combination of Shiota, Hunt and Katsurabayashi does not teach or suggest acquiring a device context of a desktop window and generating a desktop window image corresponding to the device context of the desktop window, wherein the screen range is a portion of the desktop window. The Office Action alleges that Hunt teaches this feature. Once again, as discussed above, Hunt does not select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range. Thus, there would be no need for the Hunt reference to acquire a device context of a desktop window and generate a desktop window image corresponding to the device context of the desktop window.

As a final example, with regard to claims 15, 16, 23 and 24 the combination of Shiota, Hunt and Katsurabayashi does not teach or suggest wherein the operator of said client terminal specifies the screen range during a capture mode, as recited in claims 15 and 23 or suspending the capture mode, receiving input from the operator to activate a hidden window image and resuming the capture mode, as recited in claims 16 and 24. The Office Action alleges that Hunt teaches this feature. Once again, as discussed above, Hunt does not select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based

on image data from the specified screen range. Thus, there would be no need for the Hunt reference to make use of a capture mode to specify the screen range. In fact, the term "capture mode" does not appear in the Hunt reference.

Therefore, in addition to being dependent on independent claims 1, 5, and 8 respectively, dependent claims 12-24 are also distinguishable over Shiota, Hunt and Katsurabayashi by virtue of the specific features recited in these claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 12-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

II.   Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: *March 27, 2004*

Francis Lammes
Reg. No. 55,353
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Agent for Applicant

SRT/ll